

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/474,588	12/29/1999	BALWINDER S. SAMRA	17207-00005	2447	
75	90 03/14/2003				
JOHN S BEU	•	EXAMINER			
ONE METROP	TEARSDALE LLP OLITAN SQUARE		REAGAN, JAMES A		
SUITE 2600 ST LOUIS, MO 631022740			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			3621		
			DATE MAIL ED: 03/14/2003	DATE MAIL ED: 03/14/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action		09/474,588	SAMRA ET AL.			
	•	Examiner	Art Unit			
·		James A. Reagan	3621			
The MAI	LING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
Therefore, further a final rejection unde condition for allowa	O 31 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE action by the applicant is required to aver 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 ance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a hplaces the application in			
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
b) The period f no event, ho ONLY CHE 706.07(f).	for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this powever, will the statutory period for reply expire CK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF Th	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
fee have been filed is the fee under 37 CFR 1.17 (2) as set forth in (b) at	e may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ne date for purposes of determining the period of (a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of bove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amounthe shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
	Appeal was filed on Appellant's 22(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	•				
2. The propose	ed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	•			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
	e not deemed to place the application i or appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:	·					
3. Applicant's re	eply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
	sed or amended claim(s) would ne non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
	idavit, b)⊡ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		idered but does NOT place the			
	or exhibit will NOT be considered bed e Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly			
	s of Appeal, the proposed amendmen of how the new or amended claims w	• •	•			
The status o	f the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) all	owed:					
Claim(s) ob	jected to:					
Claim(s) rej	ected: <u>1-19</u> .					
Claim(s) wit	thdrawn from consideration:					
8. The propose	ed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the atta	ached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· ·			
10. Other:	-	Ish v.	Wayes			
		/ Primar	y Exercise			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Although the independent claims address the use of the OLAP tools, the limitations are still very broad and do not disclose the actual techniques involved with using the OLAP tool. Therefore, the amendment claims do not overcome the prior art of record..